10th April 1958]

Salaries of District Munsifs and Judges

* 706 Q.—SRI T. T. DANIEL : Will the Hon. the Minister for Home be pleased to state the salaries of District Munsifs and Judges in the Kanyakumari district?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Pending integration of their services and fixation of their pay, three of the six District Munsifs allotted to this State from the former Travancore-Cochin State are drawing a salary of Rs. 400 per mensem each, two are drawing Rs. 340 per mensem each, and the last one is drawing Rs. 310 per mensem. The two Subordinate Judges transferred from the Travancore-Cochin State are getting Rs. 540 per mensem and Rs. 480 per mensem respectively. After their services are integrated and the posts held by them immediately before the appointed day are equated with the corresponding posts in this State, their pay will be fixed in accordance with the instructions issued in the matter.

Number of children committed to Borstal Institute

* 707 Q.—SRI A. A. RASHEED : Will the Hon. the Minister for Home be pleased to state the number of children committed to Borstal Institute in 1956–57?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : 'Nil'.

If the hon. Member has in mind adolescent offenders, the number is 188.

MR. SPEAKER : Questions and answers are over.

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II.—CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE *RE* RYOTWARI PATTAS.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice of a motion from the hon. Member Sri A. R. Marimuthu, calling the attention of the Hon. Minister for Revenue under Rule 40, to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the serious situation in Pattukkottai Revenue Division, caused by the failure of many small landholders of former inam and zamin villages to apply in time for ryotwari pattas under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, resulting in loss of their lands, Mr. Marimuthu . . .

III.—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. THE SPEAKER.

POINT OF ORDER *re* REPETITION OF QUESTIONS.

SRI S. LAZAR : Sir, while the question No. 662 was being answered, I raised a point of order as to whether it would be in order to permit the same question, repeatedly which has been answered previously in this House. Of course, the Chair pointed out that I should have been more specific and pointed out the rule itself and observed that it was wrong on my part to have done so. I find in Chapter 6, under Rule 31, sub-rule 11, it is specifically stated that a question which has been fully answered in the House must not be asked again. Sir, it was on this point that I rose to